

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-25 remain in the present application. Claim 8 is cancelled herein. Claim 25 is added herein. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0103914 by Dutta et al. (hereafter referred to as “Dutta”). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a method for analyzing content on a web page comprising (emphasis added):

accessing said web page comprising content, wherein said content comprises secure content;
processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content;
transferring the content of the web page to an analyzer;
analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content;
returning a result of said analyzing to a server;

and appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page; and displaying said web page and said result.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content” and “analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a web page includes secure content. The secure content of the web page is processed by a filter prior to encryption. The secure content is then transferred to an analyzer for analysis prior to encryption.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of *secure content* of a web page as claimed. Additionally, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of processing such secure content *prior to encryption* as claimed. Further, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of analyzing such secure content *prior to encryption* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content” and “analyzing the

content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content" as recited in independent Claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 9 and 17 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0156799 by Markel et al. (hereafter referred to as "Markel"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel for the following reasons.

Claim 8 is cancelled herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 8 is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that Markel, either alone or in combination with Dutta, fails to cure the deficiencies of Dutta discussed above. Specifically, Markel also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content” and “analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content” as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 9 and 17. Since dependent Claims 6, 15 and 23 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 6, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel. Therefore, Claims 6, 15 and 23 are allowable.

Claim 25

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “processing wherein said processing a web page further comprises performing sequential filtering of said web page using a plurality of filters of said filter” as recited in Claim 25. As recited and described in the present application, sequential filtering may be performed on a web page using a plurality of filters of a filter (page 13, lines 5-9).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of a *plurality of filters* as claimed. Additionally, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of *filtering a web page using* such a plurality of filters as claimed. Further, Applicants fail to find any

teaching or suggestion in Dutta of *sequential* filtering of a web page using a plurality of filters as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “processing wherein said processing a web page further comprises performing sequential filtering of said web page using a plurality of filters of said filter” as recited in Claim 25. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 25 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-7 and 9-25 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 8 / 27 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060